



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ck

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,140	06/30/2005	Yatendra Kumar	RLL-330US	4923
26815	7590	06/21/2007		
RANBAXY INC. 600 COLLEGE ROAD EAST SUITE 2100 PRINCETON, NJ 08540			EXAMINER MORRIS, PATRICIA L	
			ART UNIT 1625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/541,140

Applicant(s)

KUMAR ET AL.

Examiner

Patricia L. Morris

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 29-51 are under consideration in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in the reply filed on April 12, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 29-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Souda et al. (US 5,045,552), Sherman (WO 01/36409) and Vijayaraghavan et al. (WO 01/87831).

Souda et al. generically embrace the instant magnesium salt. Example 33 is directed to the sodium salt. However, Vijayaraghavan et al. teach the art recognized equivalence of sodium

Art Unit: 1625

and magnesium salts of analogous compounds. Note the addition salts of formula II wherein Aⁿ⁺ may be sodium or magnesium. Further, Vijayaraghavan et al. and Sherman disclose the instant process of preparing the salts. Note the bridging paragraph on pages 4 to 5 of Vijayaraghavan et al. or claim 1 of Sherman.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the disclosure of the sodium prior art compound to arrive at the instant compound. The motivation to make the compound is its structural similarities to the disclosed compound. Note that the disclosed compound is useful for treating ulcers, thus the skilled artisan would expect such structurally similar compounds to possess similar properties. While homology is considered to be present even if true "homology" is not present, such does not defeat the prima facie case of obviousness raised by the art. Attention, in this regard is directed to *In re Druey et al.*, 50 CCPA 1538, 319 F.2d 237, 138 USPQ 39, wherein Judge Worley, delivering the Court's opinion, stated:

that in "We need not decide here whether the compounds in question are properly labeled homologues. It appears to us from the authorities cited by the solicitor and appellants the term homologue is used by chemists at times in a broad sense, and at other times a narrow or strict sense. The name used to designate the relationship between the related compound is not necessarily controlling; it is the closeness of that relationship which is indicative of the obviousness or unobviousness of the new compound." 50 CCPA 1541.

Also, as the Court stated in *In re Payne et al.*, 606 F.2d 302, 203 USPQ 245 at 255 (CCPA 1979):

"the name used to designate the relationship between related compounds is not necessarily controlling; it is the closeness of that relationship which is indicative of the obviousness or unobviousness of the new compound."

In addition, any question of why would one conceive and use the similar compounds (i.e. “motivation”) is answered by the Court in *In re Gyurik et al.*, 596 F.2d 1012, 201 USPQ 552 at 557.

“In obviousness rejections based in close similarity in chemical structure, the necessary motivation to make a claimed compound, and thus the prima facie case of obviousness, rises from the expectation that compounds similar in structure will have similar properties.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of gastrointestinal ulcers, does not reasonably provide enablement for the prevention of gastrointestinal ulcers. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. Applicants are referred to *In re Fouche*, 169 USPQ 429 CCPA 1971, MPEP 716.02(b).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor,

Art Unit: 1625

7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The nature of the invention

The nature of the invention is the preparation of of the instant compound and compositions and for the treatment and prevention of all gastrointestinal ulcers.

Predictability/unpredictability of the art.

The high degree of unpredictability is well recognized in prevention of ulcers. The state of the prior art is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities. There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles established that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any treatment regimen on its face.

The amount of direction or guidance and the presence or absence of working examples

The specification is silent as to whether the instant compound prevents all gastrointestinal ulcers.

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the claims are drawn to the treatment and prevention of all ulcers.

The quantity of experimentation needed

In view of the high degree of unpredictability in the art, no working example with any results and the fact and the fact that the breadth of the claims is not commensurate with that of any objective enablement and that the nexus between inhibition of the proton pump and

Art Unit: 1625

prevention of ulcers has not been established, the quantity of experimentation needed would be undue when faced with the lack of direction and guidance present in the instant specification in regards to the compounds and pharmaceutical compositions.

In terms of the 8 Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of unpredictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by applicants. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 49 provides for the use of treatment or prevention of ulcers, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Art Unit: 1625

The claims measure the invention. United Carbon Co. v. Binney & Smith, 55 USPQ 381 at 384, col. 1, end of 1st paragraph, Supreme Court of the United States (1942).

The U.S. Court of Claims held to this standard in Lockheed Aircraft Corp. v. United States, 193 USPQ 449, "Claims measure invention and resolution of invention must be based on what is claimed".

The C.C.P.A. in 1978 held "that invention is the subject matter defined by the claims submitted by the applicant. We have consistently held that no applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim": In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, at 15.

Drawings

The formal drawings filed on June 30, 2005 have been accepted.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Patricia L. Morris
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625

plm
June 18, 2007